DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 302 522 SP 030 783

AUTHOR Fleming, Douglas S.
TITLE Instructional Supervision. A Review of Issues and Current Practices.
INSTITUTION Regional Laboratory for Educational Improvement of the Northeast & Islands, Andover, MA.
PUB DATE 87
NOTE 22p.
AVAILABLE FROM The Regional Laboratory for Educational Improvement of the Northeast and Islands, 290 S. Main Street, Andover, MA 01810 ($6.00).
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS Elementary Secondary Education; *Instructional Improvement; *Instructional Leadership; Master Teachers; *Supervisory Methods; Teacher Administrator Relationship; *Teacher Supervision; Teaching Methods

ABSTRACT

The first section of this paper briefly reviews current practices in instructional supervision, focusing on assumptions underlying many teacher supervision programs and pointing out some dilemmas involved in implementing such programs at the local district level. The second section reviews the essential features and conditions of several contemporary models of instructional supervision. Section three summarizes some of the most currently used frameworks for looking at what goes on in the classroom. The final section provides an outline for improving instructional supervision. Selected references are appended. (JD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED302522

INSTRUCTIONAL SUPERVISION

A Review of Issues and Current Practices

Douglas S. Fleming

Elements of Instructional Supervision

Models of Supervision

Lenses in the Classroom

Planning for Improved Instructional Supervision

© 1987 Rhode Island Educational Leadership Academy

SP030783

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

D.P. Crandall

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Published by

The Regional Laboratory
for Educational Improvement of the Northeast & Islands
290 South Main Street, Andover, Massachusetts 01810

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Acknowledgements

The Rhode Island Educational Leadership Academy is grateful for the research, resources, and critical reviews provided by the Rhode Island Assistance Center of The Regional Laboratory for Educational Improvement of the Northeast and Islands. Their involvement contributed to the timely development of this publication. The Academy is particularly appreciative of the organizing framework and comprehensive overview of issues and current practices provided by Douglas S. Fleming, consultant to The Regional Laboratory.

The following persons provided additional assistance in developing this resource as a background paper to accompany the statewide conference on instructional supervision: Jan Phlegar, Coordinator, Rhode Island Assistance Center for The Regional Laboratory for Educational Improvement of the Northeast and Islands; Barbara Marchilonis, Consultant to the Rhode Island LEAD Center; Philip Streifer, Assistant Superintendent of Schools, Barrington, Rhode Island; Donald Gainey, Principal, West Warwick High School, West Warwick, Rhode Island; Robert Anderson, Professor, University of South Florida, Tampa, Florida; and Susan Loucks-Horsley, Associate Director, The Regional Laboratory for Educational Improvement of the Northeast and Islands.

Finally, the Academy recognizes the ongoing support and encouragement demonstrated by its affiliated professional associations, college and university programs, and the Rhode Island Department of Education.

Charles Mojkowski
Executive Director
Rhode Island Educational Leadership Academy
November 1987

Contents

Introduction 1

Elements of Instructional Supervision 2

Models of Supervision 4

Lenses on the Classroom 8

Planning for Improved Instructional Supervision 11

Summary 14

Selected References 15

Introduction

The purpose of instructional supervision, as described by many writers, is the improvement of classroom teaching. Descriptions of instructional supervision practices frequently use the terms "reinforcing," "developmental," "formative," and "supportive," to depict the nature and use of interactions between supervisor and classroom teacher. In this sense, it is a quality-focused process that requires frequent contact with the classroom teacher to assure that districtwide or building-based goals and objectives are being carried out. An underlying belief of most supervisory programs is that observation/feedback procedures can help to improve teacher performance, increase a spirit of professionalism, and raise levels of job satisfaction. The argument is that productive and satisfied teachers perform better in the classroom, are more highly motivated, will be less likely to be absent, and tend to identify more strongly with the overarching improvement goals of the district.

In the majority of schools across the United States, the responsibility for instructional supervision is delegated to the building principal and in some cases is shared by department heads or content area supervisors and/or curriculum coordinators. In smaller districts or school buildings, the principal may be the only person providing any regular form of supervision. This practice can exacerbate role conflicts as the principal carries out other district expectations and requirements for summative evaluation, curriculum development, or other dimensions of building-level leadership. In larger districts where responsibilities for supervision, summative evaluation, and curriculum development are separated or delegated, the problems of conceptual alignment, intra-district communication, and coordination of efforts are made more acute.

A review of the literature and reflection on current practices in instructional supervision signal some persistent dilemmas in implementing instructional supervision programs at the local district level. These include:

1. **Distinguishing between supervision and evaluation** as helping functions in improving classroom instruction answers the questions Why? and When? and Where? Achieving clarity about the local philosophy of supervision and establishing district policy and procedures regarding classroom visitations, paperwork, recordkeeping, and confidentiality are essential to developing a reliable and widely used system of instructional supervision. The section of this paper on *Elements of Instructional Supervision* explores additional dimensions of the supervisory process.

2. **Selecting a model of instructional supervision** that fits the culture, context, and resources available in the district answers the question "Who does what, with whom, and how?" Instructional supervision programs can put enormous demands on staff time, increase the volume of paperwork, and challenge long-held and widely cherished beliefs about students, teaching, and learning. Without widespread preconditions and support for change, a district could engage in a program that is out of step and out of touch with the reality of the workplace. The section of this paper, *Models of Supervision*, reviews several contemporary approaches to teacher supervision.

3. **Agreeing on a common framework** for effective classroom instruction answers the question, "What do supervisors look for?" Recent decades have produced a number of research-based frameworks for defining effective delivery of instruction. Some employ achievement variables drawn from the "effective schools" research. Others use broad instructional planning models based on theories of learning. Another category focuses on certain aspects of pedagogy, such as student learning styles or mastery learning techniques. Choosing an appropriate framework with which to observe classroom instruction and providing staff with opportunities to learn about and practice different approaches represent the foundational steps in improving instructional programs. Specific examples of some research-based frameworks are provided in the section of this paper, *Lenses on the Classroom*.

4. **Planning strategically for implementation** of the role of instructional supervision answers the question "How do we get there from here?" by taking advantage of and connecting to other districtwide efforts that contribute to improved instruction. Coordinating and integrating elements of instructional supervision with ongoing efforts in curriculum development, teacher evaluation, and staff development are key considerations. Staff development activities, for example, can reinforce the goals and objectives of instructional supervision programs, but they are no substitute for a formal instructional supervision process. Linking districtwide instructional supervision to appropriate initiatives in planning for new facilities and equipment, administrator training, parent/community support, and federal or state mandates may also increase the staying power of an improved instructional supervision program. The section of this paper on Planning for Improved Instructional Supervision addresses additional strategic concerns.

Elements of Instructional Supervision

In articulating their program of instructional supervision, local districts reveal their underlying assumptions about the nature of supervision as a helping activity. They demonstrate their perception of the practical value and benefits of assisting teachers in their ongoing professional growth and development. The following categories represent sets of assumptions about the nature and outcomes found in several widely accepted models of teacher supervision. Readers are invited to match their experience and insights against these sets of assumptions.

1. **Effective supervision is based on a belief that effective teaching behaviors can be defined.** These desirable behaviors, or teacher performance criteria, can be specified by indicators that are observable and measurable. The effective supervisor can explain and model these behaviors to the faculty. The behaviors and indicators become the basis for supervisory observation and feedback.

2. **Effective supervision is based on observing and analyzing classroom teaching behaviors.** Classrooms are complex settings. Numerous interactions occur simultaneously. Only carefully planned and practiced observations can provide the basis for meaningful choices and decisions about the improvement of teaching. Effective supervisors collect data in a variety of ways in order to develop an accurate picture of classroom performance.

3. **Effective supervision requires skillful conferencing about practice.** Even the most veteran teachers can get apprehensive about classroom visitations. Teachers must feel comfortable with the process and be receptive to the opportunity for honest and informed feedback. The feedback should be objective and non-judgmental. The conference is an opportunity to identify strategies or alternative actions to improve performance. The teacher's interpretation of what was observed is an essential feature of the conference. Teachers should be encouraged to evaluate the effectiveness of the conference as a helping strategy.

4. **Effective supervision can attend to curriculum issues, too.** Supervision can look at what is taught as well as how it is taught. Supervisors can determine whether teachers use curriculum objectives as road maps for classroom instruction, and whether learning activities are planned to achieve maximum engagement of students in learning the concepts, skills, and attitudes of the curriculum. Supervisors can also promote use of tests as only one of the ways student progress is evaluated.

5. **Effective supervision requires skillful communication.** Clear verbal communication is only a part of exchanging viewpoints on teacher classroom performance. Through skillful listening, the supervisor discovers the needs and interests of teachers. Facial expressions, gestures, stance, space, and eye contact send powerful messages. Resolving conflict in a way that promotes problem-solving and mutual understanding is an important aspect of effective supervision.

6. **Effective supervision demands flexibility and initiative.** The supervisor can raise levels of awareness and encourage interest in new practices through questioning and providing information, resources, and opportunities to participate in other forms of professional development. Effective supervisors are able respond to individuals and situations in different ways. They understand the process of change in individuals and organizations and persevere against attitudes, values, or behaviors that mitigate against improvement. Effective supervisors are able to function productively in groups during faculty meetings, planning committees, and inservice programs. A key leadership attribute is the ability to help others to set goals and to define steps to achieve them.

7. **Effective supervision represents an investment in others.** "Encouraging the human spirit and providing a fertile ground for growth" is one of the most important tasks of instructional supervision. Effective supervisors understand concepts of motivation and career stages of educational professionals. Supervisors encourage staff to develop autonomy in analyzing their own beliefs and behaviors. Supervisors promote teacher participation in staff development programs that are based on the needs identified in supervisory conferences.

Models of Supervision

The purpose of this section is to review the essential features and conditions of several contemporary models of instructional supervision. Local districts engaged in establishing or improving a formal instructional supervision program may consult the selected references section for more detailed information on the methods described here. In practice, local districts frequently develop hybrid programs that incorporate features from several models. In any case, district planners are encouraged to devote considerable time and resources in assuring that new policies and procedures are widely understood and accepted.

Contemporary models

1. Traditional Supervision

Traditional supervision is based on a view of the supervisor as superior and the teacher as subordinate. It gives more authority and initiative to the supervisor, who gathers whatever data seems important or is required by district policy, makes judgments about the teacher's effectiveness, and decides what should be done next. In the traditional model of supervision, which is easy to schedule and consumes less time than some other models, the teacher is in a more passive role and is generally not empowered to participate in decisions regarding his or her work. The supervisor may or may not be using a "desirable practices" framework that has been formally adopted or developed by the district. Ryan (1971) provides this view on traditional supervisory practice:

> Traditionally supervision was carried out by a principal or some authority figure in the school system. Its purposes were to monitor the performance of teachers, occasionally to give new ideas, but generally to keep teachers on their toes.

2. Teacher Self-Evaluation

Bailey (1985) writing for the National Education Association, contends that teachers have a natural interest in and inclination for improvement, and that teachers can engage independently and privately in self improvement efforts, using videotape feedback and applying a framework for identifying important and basic teaching behaviors.

The NEA framework includes:

1. Identifying set and closure
2. Identifying verbal cues
3. Identifying nonverbal cues
4. Applying means-referenced objectives in lesson planning
5. Using observation forms in analyzing videotaped performance

3. Clinical Supervision

Cogan (1973) and Goldhammer, Anderson, and Krajewski (1980) were among the first to describe a model of supervision based on a view of supervisor and teacher working together as colleagues. The term "clinical supervision" may suggest a rather detached and dissected view of teaching, but the model is predicated on a respect for the integrity and individuality of teachers. In clinical supervision, the supervisor does not "coerce, demand, or evaluate," but instead "encourages, explores, and collaborates" (Cooper, 1984).

The clinical supervision model consists of several components:

1. Establishing the supervisor-teacher relationship
2. Planning the lesson or unit to be observed
3. Agreeing on the focus and method of classroom observation
4. Observing and collecting descriptive data on actual teaching behaviors
5. Analyzing the data to discover the meaning and implications
6. Planning the strategy of the conference
7. Teacher decisions about teaching behaviors and student learning
8. Planning for further instruction and observation

The number of actual stages and their labels vary by source (Goldhammer, 1969; Mosher and Purpel, 1972; Cogan, 1973). To make clinical supervision work, the supervisor must be willing to spend considerable time working with individual teachers *on their perceived needs* regarding classroom issues and problems. In pre-observation conferences, the supervisor and teacher meet to discuss the lessons to be observed and to clarify the teacher's objectives, concerns, and areas of interest. The teacher and supervisor *mutually agree* what kind of information or data should be collected. During the actual classroom observation, the supervisor must have skill in applying different classroom observation techniques. Following the classroom observation, the supervisor and teacher confer once more to examine the observation data, interpret their meaning, and determine *what actions the teacher wants to make.* The post-observation conference requires the supervisor to demonstrate skills in human relations, interpersonal communications, motivation, leadership, and planning.

4. Peer Supervision

Berliner (1982) and Joyce and Showers (1982) believe that in order for teachers to effectively change their teaching behaviors, someone must "coach" them as they try out new teaching practices in their own classrooms.

The peer supervision model assumes that teachers can be valuable resources to one another. It provides training in the skills of collegial consultation: classroom observation, data collection and analysis, and peer conferencing.

Teachers then pair with one another to observe specific instructional behaviors in each other's classroom, and to provide objective feedback on the use of new practices.

To make peer supervision models work, there must be a strong catalyst for action at the local district or building level. Peer supervision relies on new patterns of interactions among teachers and between administrators and groups of teachers who are providing peer support to one another. Teachers must receive adequate preparation and training, release time to visit classrooms, and assurances that their participation in these efforts are separate from the district's formal teacher evaluation process.

5. Mentor Teacher and Master Teacher

Mentor Teacher and Master Teacher programs are more recent developments that contribute to improved supervision of instruction. These approaches are founded on the belief that "excellence in teaching should be rewarded, that teachers learn best from other teachers, and that career ladders can provide impetus for improvement in the profession" (Marshall, 1985). A variant of peer supervision, the Mentor Teacher and Master Teacher models can be used to:

- direct assistance to new teachers, reassigned teachers, or teachers who need special support
- demonstrate desired teaching practices in classroom settings
- provide follow-up to in-service instruction by external consultants
- implement inservice programs in specific curriculum areas (i.e. computers, language arts, science, mathematics)
- establish collegial support systems at the district or building level

In practice, Mentor Teachers or Master Teachers may also be expected to participate in the development of program budgets, the collection and analysis of evaluation data, and the preparation of reports for presentation to school boards or management teams. To make Mentor Teacher or Master Teacher models of supervision work, care must be taken to keep the interaction data collected during classroom observations separate from performance data collected for the district teacher evaluation system. The relationship between the building principal and the mentor or master teacher must acknowledge the *confidentiality* of the mentor teacher/classroom teacher observations and conferences. Recordkeeping procedures and storage of documents must be mutually established with teachers beforehand. All interactions should focus on *analysis of practice by the teacher* with the assistance of the mentor.

6. Performance Objectives Approach

The performance objectives approach is based on the belief that supervisors and teachers can jointly establish work objectives, agree on well-established action plans, and determine accomplishment through measurable outcomes and results (Redfern, 1980).

In this model or variations on it, annual work objectives are determined by mutual review of the teacher's duties and responsibilities. Teachers are frequently encouraged to establish performance objectives in four or five broad areas. These typically include objectives related to *organizational or administrative concerns*, ("participate in a faculty advisory committee"), objectives related to the achievement of *program goals* (develop a new unit on nutrition for seventh grade life science classes), objectives related to *performance of learners* ("at least 80% of my students will be able to do 80% of the problems in long-division"), and objectives related to the *delivery of instruction* ("increase use of wait-time and higher-order questioning techniques"). Improvement needs are identified, and actions plans are written to describe steps to accomplish objectives over time. Accomplishment of the results are monitored, assessed, and discussed at appropriate intervals.

To make this approach to instructional supervision work, a clear and comprehensive definition of desirable, expected behaviors (responsibility criteria) must be widely understood. Categories of anticipated goal areas must also be agreed upon and accepted. Even then, insisting that the annual performance objectives come from the list of responsibility criteria, and fall within predetermined categories, may reduce some flexibility in addressing unique teacher needs. Another reality of the workplace centers on the degree to which there is mutuality in the goal-setting conference. As McGreal (1983) points out:

> It is the supervisor's responsibility to establish an atmosphere in the conference that will allow the teacher to be an equal participant. On the other hand, it is the teacher's responsibility to contribute to the discussion. Suppose the supervisor asks the teacher what the two of them might work on this year, and the teacher makes such comments as "nothing," or "I have been teaching 20 years, this seems ridiculous for me to have to do." The supervisor is literally forced to dictate something for the teacher to do -- a situation that undermines the process for everyone.

Related Approaches

The field of staff development offers supervisors a wide variety of approaches that have the potential for meeting the needs of teachers. Loucks-Horsley and her associates (1987) recently identified several such approaches in addition to those discussed earlier. They are:

Teacher-as-Researcher
Implementing Innovative Practices
Teachers' Centers
Teacher Institutes
Networks
Partnerships
Training of Trainers

These approaches differ along several dimensions, including:

- the goal or objective to be pursued (e.g., skill building, information sharing, problem solving)
- the mode of delivery (e.g., training, inquiry, networking)
- the underlying assumptions (about adult learning, skill transfer, etc.)
- the conditions necessary for success (e.g., released time, collaboration with others, outside expertise)

Exploring this range of alternatives to professional development offers supervisors a broader role in the growth of teachers and the potential for a strong link between the school or district staff development program and instructional supervision.

Lenses on the Classroom

The first section of this paper reviewed assumptions underlying many teacher supervision programs in the United States. The second section examined several different structures or models that incorporate some of those assumptions. These sections treated the how and who of instructional supervision. What follows is a summary of some of the most currently used frameworks for looking at what goes on in classrooms. The list is by no means exhaustive but is intended to serve as a representation of the focus of contemporary supervisory practice in education.

1. Effective Teaching Literature

Examples of this approach in supervisory practice include the inservice programs Teacher Expectations and Student Achievement (TESA), Gender Expectations and Student Achievement (GESA), and Resident Supervisory Support Training (RSST). The practice draws on the research base on effective teaching characterized by the work of Brophy and Good (1986) and Rosenshine (1979).

The following sample of critical teacher behaviors is based on the research on teacher expectations and is taken from a model of peer observation known as GESA - Gender Expectations and Student Achievement (Grayson, 1985):

1. Response opportunity
2. Individual acknowledgement
3. Wait-time
4. Teacher proximity and movement in the classroom
5. Touching/reproof
6. Listening/use of probing questions
7. Higher level questioning
8. Analytical feedback to student responses
9. Student engaged time
10. Classroom arrangement

Another set of effective instructional behaviors selected from the research on effective teaching is represented by the program Explicit Teaching - also known as "Direct Teaching" or "Active Teaching" (Rosenshine, 1982).

1. Structure learning
2. Proceed in small steps but at a brisk pace
3. Give detailed and redundant instructions
4. Provide many examples
5. Ask a large number of questions/provide active practice
6. Elicit success rate of 80% or higher in initial learning
7. Divide seatwork into smaller assignments
8. Frequently monitor seatwork
9. Allow independent practice

2. **Effective Schools Research**

A sampling of supervisory criteria based on application of effective schools research include (Edmonds, 1982; Gauthier, 1983):

1. Safe and orderly environments
2. Clear school mission
3. Visible and articulate leadership
4. High expectations
5. Time on-task
6. Frequent monitoring of student progress
7. High levels of home-school communications

3. **Effective Lesson Design** (most commonly, The Hunter Model, also called ITIP or Success Based Education)

A sampling of supervisory criteria based on the research on effective lesson design by Hunter (1980) includes:

1. Establishing anticipatory set
2. Stating objectives and purpose
3. Providing the input (instruction)
4. Modeling desired behaviors
5. Probing for comprehension/checking for understanding
6. Providing guided practice
7. Assigning independent practice

4. **Models of Teaching**

Joyce and Weil (1979) identified eighty defensible patterns that teachers use to shape a curriculum or course, to select instructional materials, or to guide teacher actions. Their models of teaching are grouped into four families. For each model there are

objective observation criteria to assess the degree to which the components of each model were evidenced by the teacher during a classroom observation.

Specific supervisory observations would be conducted to establish whether the teacher were appropriately employing:

1. Social interaction models (social inquiry, role playing)
2. Information processing models (inquiry teaching, concept attainment)
3. Personal models (non-directive teaching, classroom meetings)
4. Behavior modification/Cybernetic models (programmed instruction, simulations)

5. **Teaching Styles and Learning Styles**

Dunn and Dunn (1978), McCarthy (1980), and Gregorc (1982) have written extensively on teaching styles and learning styles and their implications for teachers in planning daily instruction.

The Dunns use a broad definition of teaching styles that includes the following elements:

1. Instructional planning
2. Teaching methods
3. Student groupings
4. Room design
5. Teaching environment
6. Evaluation techniques
7. Educational philosophy
8. Teaching characteristics
9. Student preferences

These five ways of looking at teaching do not add up to the universe of instructional supervision, but they do provide concrete examples of ordering complex sequences, correlates, and interactions. Other "lenses on the classroom" used in contemporary instructional supervision (too often without provision for ongoing practice and feedback) include:

- **Active Mathematics Teaching** -- an instructional model developed by Tom Good and David Grouws at the University of Missouri Mathematics Project

    1. Daily review (8 min)
    2. Development (20 min)
    3. Seatwork (15 min)
    4. Homework assignment (2 min)
    5. Special reviews- weekly, monthly

- **Beginning Teacher Evaluation Study (BTES)** -- focusing on two measures of student learning; classroom behavior and test scores; and better known as the ALT (Academic Learning Time model)

1. Diagnosis
2. Prescription
3. Presentation
4. Monitoring
5. Feedback

- **Mastery Learning** -- based on principles espoused by Bloom, Block, Guskey, and others (Bloom).

1. Clearly define instructional objectives
2. Task analysis
3. Assess current student skills
4. Orient students
5. Initial teaching
6. Assess mastery
7. Corrective and positive action as needed
8. Enrichment/extension

The presence of the program criteria in reduced type is not intended to signal diminished importance. Local district planners engaged in establishing or improving a formal instructional supervision program may consult the selected references section to acquire more detailed information on the programs cited here. In practice, local districts frequently adopt teacher performance criteria that incorporate features from several models or research bases. District planners are encouraged to devote time and resources in assuring that new frameworks for observing classroom teaching behaviors are widely understood and accepted.

Planning for Improved Instructional Supervision

The term "improved instructional supervision" can be interpreted very differently by people representing distinct role groups or experiences in the district. Some people envision improved instructional supervision as districtwide or school-building based committees engaged in long meetings and self-analysis, attempting to reach consensus on goals and objectives that are translated into policy statements or action plans for others to follow. Others picture improved instructional supervision as being small groups of teachers and other district staff operating on a special budget and authorized to make grade-level or department-wide changes in supervisory practices. Still others view improved instructional supervision as a districtwide or building level mandate issued as a prerogative of central leadership. Any of these views might be correct. School improvement efforts, in general, have been defined as "the pursuit of any goal that benefits students and that has as a focus the classroom and school building" (Loucks-Horsley and Hergert, 1985). Improved instructional supervision, then, might mean:

- Modifying an elementary school science program to include inquiry teaching approaches

- Developing and implementing districtwide policy on the use of classroom observation data and post-observation conferences with teachers

- Adopting a peer observation program to help classroom teachers practice new instructional strategies using collegial feedback

- Providing inservice training in classroom observation and conferencing techniques to administrators and others with supervisory responsibilities

- Applying the characteristics of effective schools research in the district's criteria for effective instructional practices

There can also be different perspectives on what constitutes a legitimate and effective school improvement effort. One set of assumptions, based on research and experience, includes the following:

1. School improvement activities must address persistent problems and increase the capacity of the organization to attack future ones.

2. School improvement cannot happen unless something observably different occurs between teachers and students.

3. School improvement efforts are more likely to have lasting effects when the solutions to problems are defined as classroom practices so that teachers have clear images of what desired practices look like and what is expected of them.

Do we make it ourselves or import it?

An important question asked by a district or school building setting out to improve instructional supervision is "what is the best way to get there?" The "make it/buy it" decision may appear simplistic, but sooner or later a committee of one or a committee of ten must contend with this issue. For some issues in supervision, there are programs or practices that have been developed somewhere else and that have been used successfully by teachers and supervisors in a number of schools. Research has shown that **teachers can and do use practices developed by others** when those practices can be described clearly and when they have evaluation data to support their effectiveness. For other supervisory goals, the local district or building may choose to assume the role of developer. This frequently requires greater investments of time and money. Developing programs locally can cost as much as twenty times as much as adopting an existing program. On the other hand, the district may have the professional expertise, support staff, and other resources necessary to carry out the developer function, or it may feel that a more process-oriented approach to instructional supervision will assure greater staff cooperation and participation.

In either case, what are some things district planners can do to implement new practices more smoothly?

Whether your district is going to build a new program, policy, or set of practices from scratch, or whether your district is going to identify, select, and apply materials or procedures developed elsewhere, there are some key elements for program planners to consider. These are listed below (Loucks-Horsley and Hergert, 1985).

1. **Choose the staff to design or implement the new program** or practice. A key decision to be made is whether the program will be voluntary or mandated, piloted with a few schools or implemented whole-scale. Who is selected to plan or to implement can be critical to the success of any improvement effort.

2. **Determine what levels of skill or knowledge already exist.** This step will help to target specific staff development and support needs.

3. **Give the new program or practice a fair trial** by sticking with it for a specified amount of time. Encourage staff to suspend disbelief early on.

4. **Refrain from making major adaptations too early.** One of the most common is "watering the program down" by selecting only the easiest or most attractive to do.

5. **Encourage staff to put in the extra time** that all first efforts require: practicing new skills, using new materials, trying new approaches.

6. **Provide both initial and follow-up training** to assure that new methods, materials, objectives, and systems are fully understood. The training should be conducted by people who are totally familiar with the new program, who are experienced trainers, and who understand the principles of adult learning.

7. **Assign support roles to provide follow-up assistance** during the implementation phase. Demonstrations, coaching, problem-solving sessions, and informal observations are all examples of support strategies.

8. **Establish a timeline for implementing the improvement project.** Research suggests that a significant change in schools takes three to five years from its initiation to the point where it becomes truly incorporated into the ongoing life of a school and its classrooms.

9. **Get people involved in evaluating the impact of new programs or practices** very early. When teachers connect their daily behaviors to student performance, a powerful reinforcement takes place.

10. **Make refinements as you go.** Encourage staff to share their experiences and make small adjustments as they proceed.

11. **Ensure that the new practice "sticks."** The program or practice will be more likely to be continued if the following conditions exist:

- follow-up meetings with staff are conducted to review how program goals and components are being applied
- the practice is formally acknowledged in the district curriculum plan or teacher's manual
- a line item budget is established to replenish materials and supplies
- written guidelines for applying the program/practice have been developed
- approval and authorization from key administrators has been obtained

Summary

The process of instructional supervision may be enacted in different ways and by using different frameworks for looking at teaching, but the larger goals remain quite similar: to help each teacher grow toward higher stages of personal and professional development and competency. This paper has acknowledged some of the desirable features and potentials of supervisory practice, several models of teacher-supervisor relationships, and a number of different lenses or frameworks for determining "where the teacher is" in terms of instructional issues and concerns. The implications for schools and districts considering changes in their present supervisory systems are not insignificant. The successful management of instructional improvement is closely tied to the capabilities of the staff, the resources and support available from outside the school, and the underlying values and long-range goals of the district. In particular, the skill of the building principal or supervisor in stimulating discussions and encouraging acceptable options in professional growth among faculty is a key factor in helping all teachers achieve their full potential.

Selected References

Acevedo, Mary A., et al., **A Guide for Conducting an Effective Feedback Session,** University of Texas, Austin, Texas: 1976.

Acheson, Keith, "The Principal's Role in Instructional Leadership," **OSSC Bulletin** Vol. 28, No. 8, ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management, University of Oregon, Eugene, Oregon: 1985.

Acheson, Keith, and Gall, Meredith D., **Techniques in the Clinical Supervision of Teachers,** Longman Publishers, New York: 1980.

Bailey, Gerald D., **Teacher Self-Assessment: A Means for Improving Classroom Instruction,** National Education Association, Washington, DC: 1981, pp. 19-59.

Barnes, Susan, **Synthesis of Selected Research on Teaching Findings,** Report 9009, Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, Austin, Texas: 1981.

Bloom, Benjamin S., **Human Characteristics and School Learning,** McGraw-Hill, New York: 1976.

Brandt, Ronald S., and Tyler, Ralph W., "Goals and Objectives," **Fundamental Curriculum Decisions,** 1983 Yearbook of the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, Fenwick W. English, Editor, Alexandria, Virginia: 1983.

Bunker, R. Mason, "Beyond Inservice: Toward Staff Renewal," **Journal of Teacher Education,** Volume 28, Number 2 (March/April, 1977), pp. 31-34.

Cogan, Morris L., **Clinical Supervision,** Houghton Mifflin Company, Boston, Massachusetts: 1973.

Cornett, Claudia E., **What You Should Know About Teaching and Learning Styles,** Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation, Bloomington, Indiana: 1983.

Combs, Arthur W., Avila, Donald L., and Purkey, William W., **Helping Relationships: Basic Components for the Helping Profession,** Allyn and Bacon, Boston, Massachusetts: 1971.

Crandall, David P. and Associates, **People, Policies, and Practices: Examining The Chain of School Improvement,** Vol I-X, The NETWORK, Inc., Andover, Massachusetts: 1982.

Edmonds, Ronald, "Effective Schools for the Urban Poor," **Educational Leadership,** October, Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, Arlington, Virginia: 1979.

Gage, Nathaniel L., **The Scientific Basis of the Art of Teaching,** Teacher's College Press, New York: 1978.

Gauthier, William J. Jr., **Instructionally Effective Schools: A Model and A Process** (Monograph Number 1), Connecticut State Department of Education, Hartford, Connecticut: 1983.

Glickman, Carl D., **Developmental Supervision: Alternative Practices for Helping Teachers to Improve Instruction,** Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, Alexandria, Virginia: 1981.

Glickman, Carl D., **Supervision of Instruction,** Allyn and Bacon, Inc., Newton, Massachusetts: 1985.

Goldhammer, Robert, **Clinical Supervision,** Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, New York: 1969.

Goldhammer, Robert, Anderson, Robert H., and Krajewski, Robert J., **Clinical Supervision: Special Methods for the Supervision of Teachers,** Second Edition, Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, New York: 1980.

Good, Thomas L., and Brophy, Jere E., **Looking In Classrooms** (2nd Edition), Harper and Row, New York: 1978.

Good, Thomas L., and Brophy, Jere E., "Teacher Behavior and Student Achievement," **Handbook of Research on Teaching** (Third Edition), Merlin Wittrock, Editor, Macmillan Publishing Company, New York: 1986.

Gordon, Thomas, **Leadership Effectiveness Training,** Wyden Books, Ridgefield, Connecticut: 1977.

Gregorc, Anthony E., **An Adult's Guide to Style,** Gabriel Systems, Maynard, Massachusetts: 1982.

Griffith, Frances, **A Handbook for the Observation of Teaching and Learning,** Pendell Publishing, Midland, Michigan: 1973.

Hamilton, Delores W., **Resident Supervisory Support for Teachers Training Manual,** Banneker Academic High School, Washington, DC: 1986.

Hunter, Madeline, "Six Types of Supervisory Conferences," **Educational Leadership** Volume 37, Alexandria, Virginia: 1980, pp. 408-412.

Iwanicki, Edward F., "Contract Plans: A Professional Growth-Oriented Approach to Evaluating Teacher Performance," in **Handbook of Teacher Evaluation,** Edited by Jason Millman, Sage Publications, Beverly Hills, California: 1981.

Joyce, Bruce, and Showers, Beverly, "Coaching of Teaching," **Educational Leadership,** Vol. 40, No. 1, October, Alexandria, Virginia: 1982, pp. 4-8, 10.

Joyce, B., and Weil, M., **Models of Teaching** (Second Edition), Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: 1980.

Little, Judith Warren, et al., "Professional Development Roles and Relationships: Principles and Skills of 'Advising,'" Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development, San Francisco, California: 1984.

Loucks, Susan F., and Crandall, David P., "The Practice Profile: An All-Purpose Tool for Program Communication, Staff Development, Evaluation, and Implementation," The NETWORK, Inc., Andover, Massachusetts: 1982.

Loucks-Horsley, Susan, and Cox, Pat L., "It's All in The Doing: What Recent Research Says About Implementation," paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, Louisiana: 1984.

Loucks-Horsley, Susan, and Hergert, Leslie F., **An Action Guide to School Improvement,** ASCD, Alexandria, Virginia/The NETWORK, Inc., Andover, Massachusetts: 1985.

Loucks-Horsley, Susan, et al., **Continuing To Learn: A Guidebook for Teacher Development,** The Regional Laboratory for Educational Improvement of the Northeast and Islands, Andover, Massachusetts: 1987.

Marshall, Kit, **Teachers Helping Teachers: A Guidebook For The New Professional In Education,** Kit Marshall and Associates, Cameron Park, California: 1985.

McCarthy, Bernice, **The 4MAT System: Teaching to Learning Styles with Right/Left Mode Techniques,** Excel, Inc., Barrington, Illinois: 1980.

McGreal, Thomas L., **Successful Teacher Evaluation,** Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, Alexandria, Virginia: 1983.

McGreal, Thomas L., "Helping Teachers Set Goals," **Educational Leadership,** Vol. 37, No. 5, Alexandria, Virginia: February, 1980, pp. 414-19.

Medley, Donald M., "The Effectiveness of Teachers," in **Research on Teaching,** P.L. Peterson and H. J. Walberg, editors, McCutchan Publishing, Berkeley, California: 1979.

Miles, Matthew B., **Learning To Work In Groups** (2nd Edition), Teachers College Press, Columbia University, New York: 1981.

Mosher, R.L., and Purpel, D.E., **Supervision: The Reluctant Profession,** Houghton- Mifflin Company, Boston, Massachusetts: 1972.

Reavis, Charles A., **Teacher Improvement Through Clinical Supervision,** PDK Fastback #111, Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation, Bloomington, Indiana: 1978.

Redfern, George B., **Evaluating Teachers and Administrators: A Performance Objectives Model,** Westview Publications, Boulder, Colorado: 1980.

Rosenshine, Barak V., "Teaching Functions in Instructional Programs," **The Elementary School Journal,** Vol. 83, No. 4, The University of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois: 1983.

Ryan, Kevin, "Supervision for A New Era," **Contemporary Psychology,** No. 16, 1971, p. 557.

Sarason, Seymour B., **The Culture of School and the Problem of Change,** Allyn and Bacon, Boston, Massachusetts: 1971.

Sergiovanni, Thomas J., **Handbook for Effective Department Leadership,** Allyn and Bacon, Inc., Newton, Massachusetts: 1984.

Sergiovanni, Thomas J., "Toward A Theory of Supervisory Practice: Integrating Scientific, Clinical, and Artistic Views," in **Supervision of Teaching,** Edited by Thomas J. Sergiovanni, Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, Alexandria, Virginia: 1982.

Sparks, Dennis, and Sparks, Georgea Mohlman, **Effective Teaching for Higher Achievement,** Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, Alexandria, Virginia: 1984.

Snyder, Karolyn J., and Anderson, Robert H., **Managing Productive Schools: Toward an Ecology,** Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, New York: 1986.

Snyder, Karolyn J., and Anderson, Robert H., "Supervision in Focus," a continuing series in **Record in Educational Administration and Supervision:**

Volume 5, Number 2, "Different Strokes" pp. 36-38.

Volume 6, Number 1, "The Relative Adolescence of Interventional Supervision" pp. 31-33.

Volume 7, Number 1, "Cues for Supervisors from the Corporate Best-Sellers" pp. 38-40.

Volume 7, Number 2, "Competencies for Effective Supervision" pp. 29-31.

Snyder, Karolyn J., "Clinical Supervision in the 1980's," **Educational Leadership,** Volume 38, Alexandria, Virginia: April, 1981, pp. 521-524.

Stallings, Jane, "What Research Has To Say To Administrators of Secondary Schools About Effective Teaching and Staff Development," in **Creating Conditions for Effective Teaching,** R&D Center for Educational Policy and Management, College of Education, Eugene, Oregon: 1981.

Wittrock, Merlin, Editor. **Handbook of Research on Teaching** (Third Edition), Macmillan Publishing Company, New York: 1986.